

National Capital Region Inventory & Monitoring Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

4 June 2002

Center for Urban Ecology

LIST OF ATTENDEES

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PARK/OFFICE</u>
Betsy Chittenden (for Chris Jones)	WOTR
Karen Cucurullo	MANA
Doug Curtis	CUE
Carolyn Davis (for Jim Voigt)	CATO
Ellen Gray	I & M NCR
Bob Hickman	PRWI
Sybil Hood	I & M NCR
Dianne Ingram	CHOH
Marcus Koenen	I & M NCR
Dan Sealy (for Dottie Marshall)	GWMP
John Sinclair	I & M NCR
Stephan Syphax	NACE
Christina Wright	I & M NCR

I. Introductions and Welcome – Ellen Gray, I&M Coordinator, NCR.

Purpose of the Board of Directors (BOD) – To oversee the development of the National Capital Region's monitoring strategy in a way that preserves and enhances the region's most important natural resources.

Outcomes of this meeting: 1) Evaluate network monitoring goals, 2) Decide if network permits should be further pursued, and 3) Discuss involvement of BOD in July Monitoring Workshop.

II. Update on NCR monitoring plans.

Ellen Gray presented a timeline of the NCR Vital Signs Monitoring Program showing the role of the BOD in the process of developing a regional long-term monitoring plan.

Marcus Koenen, Monitoring Coordinator, provided an Update on Science Advisory Committee (SAC). The SAC has met four times since the last BOD. Their compressed meeting schedule was due to WASO's request that the National Capital Network move its Monitoring Workshop (aka scoping workshop) to FY02 – ahead of schedule from FY03. The SAC has been meeting regularly to prepare background information for the Monitoring Workshop.

In January, the SAC identified the region's most important resources including: Air, Geology, Invertebrates, Landscape, RTE (Rare, threatened, and endangered species), Vegetation Communities, Water, and Wildlife. The SAC divided itself into 8

workgroups, each focusing on one of the important resources. Each workgroup identified additional subject experts who were invited to attend future SAC Meetings. See Attachment 1 for list of SAC participants.

The March and May SAC meetings focused on identifying resource components associated with each Important Resource, the threats associated with each resource component, the ecological effect, and identified potential vital sign. The Geology workgroup, for example, identified ground water as a resource component that was threatened by agriculture (among other factors) causing changes in water chemistry and ground water table levels. Potential indicators included monitoring the ground water table levels and water chemistry.

The information developed by all workgroups will be synthesized for the Monitoring Workshop. Subject experts from region have been invited to review the SAC's work, prioritize threats and vital signs, identify monitoring protocols, and develop specific monitoring goals.

Network Goals: In addition to developing background information for the Monitoring Workshop, the NPS participants of the SAC met to develop Network Monitoring Goals. Servicewide goals have been established but it was felt important to develop network goals to reflect the parks' and the network's needs. The goals were developed by identifying important themes. The Network I & M staff reviewed the themes and articulated them with 5 goals. The Network Goals were then approved by the NPS members of the SAC with minor changes. The goals were presented:

1. Identify and monitor indicators of ecosystem health using scientific protocols in order to detect changes and preserve the region's natural resources and landscapes over the long-term.
2. Identify and monitor resource threats and develop mitigation options to support ecosystem management.
3. Manage, maintain, and analyze regionally common data sets in accessible and usable forms in support of long-term resource preservation, protection, and education.
4. Establish collaborative relationships among National Park Service divisions, partnering agencies, and organizations to gather and share information.
5. Coordinate periodic program review and adapt new strategies as needed.

The BOD approved Goals 1 –4 with minor changes as follows:

1. Identify and monitor indicators of ecosystem health over the long-term using scientific protocols to detect changes in the region's natural resources and landscapes in support of resource protection.

2. Identify and monitor resource threats and develop mitigation options to support ecosystem management.
3. Manage, maintain, and analyze regionally common data sets in accessible and usable forms in support of long-term resource preservation, protection, and education.
4. Establish collaborative relationships among National Park Service divisions, educational institutions, partnering agencies, and organizations to gather and share information.

Goal 1 was changed to emphasize resource protection over preservation, which was seen as too big of a leap from monitoring to preservation. Educational institutions were added to goal 4 on the recommendation of Dan Sealy.

The need for goal 5 was questioned because it is part of the operating process, rather than a goal. In addition, the BOD Charter specifies a program review every 5-years. [note: the charter states: *Five Year Program Review*: At the end of fiscal year 2004, the Board will undertake a comprehensive Program Review. The purpose of this review will be to evaluate accomplishments and products, protocols used for gathering data, data management, fiscal management, and staffing. The Program Review shall provide the principal basis for any significant changes in program direction and any recommendations will be forwarded to the National I & M office.]. The word “period” was also considered vague and if we have such a goal, we should consider something more specific.

The BOD identified the following questions that the I & M Team should answer:

Is this a goal or a condition of the program or a mission statement?

BOD identified the themes that should be incorporated into the goal if the goal is deemed necessary by the I & M Team:

Maintain a relevant program
Flexible
Evaluation/Review
Relevant to park goals

Task: The I & M Team agreed to review the questions raised by the BOD and revise the goal accordingly. A new goal will be presented to the NPS members of the SAC and BOD for approval.

II. Network Permits

Network permits allow a researcher to obtain one permit covering multiple parks. The BOD had requested additional information concerning a Network Permit within the Research Permit and Reporting System during the fall 2001 meeting. John Sinclair,

Biological Inventories Coordinator, provided a brief overview of the proposed Network Permit, and issues related to the permits. Specifically, all permit review and compliance will remain the responsibility of the each park. Once parks have reviewed the application, proposals, and completed compliance paperwork, a superintendent selected by the BOD to represent all parks would sign the permit. The permit would include General, Network, and Park specific rules and conditions. Although the Network Permit would not significantly reduce Park Personnel time, it would streamline the process for the Principal Investigators. A draft of the Network Permit Memorandum of Agreement was distributed to all parks for review. Betsy Chittenden asked what would be the mechanism to institute a network permit. John Sinclair explained that it would be a Memorandum of Agreement among the network parks. It was also clarified that a park could withdraw from the MOA at any time. Karen Cucurullo mentioned that she hesitated to agree or disagree with having a permit for the whole network without knowing how the resource managers felt about it. At the request of the BOD, the topic of Network Permits will be presented to resource managers at the June 2002 NAT meeting. If the resource managers are interested in it, it will be pursued further. If not, NCR will not pursue a network permit.

IV. Involvement of the BOD to make the July Monitoring Workshop Successful.

Ellen Gray described the tentative agenda for the Monitoring Workshop, July 9-11 at Shepherdstown, WV (Attachment 2). The BOD discussed the three planned breakout sessions on July 9th: Using sound science to manage the parks – exploring the relevancy of long-term monitoring to park operations; Crossing park boundaries – developing partnerships to protect natural resources inside and outside of the National Parks; and Educating the public – how can scientists work with park interpreters?

Betsy Chittenden suggested that a breakout session that might be useful is a discussion of how monitoring would be implemented in cultural parks that have no natural resource enabling legislation. She also suggested that the second breakout session on partnerships not be too broad, but focus on what the opportunities are and how could partnering work, considering legalities. Dan Sealy suggested a session on threats.

Registration forms for the meeting were distributed for Board members. The BOD was asked to invite representatives from various park divisions to the meeting, particularly interpreters. The BOD will also invite any key stakeholders that the I&M Team did not already invite. Karen Cucurullo pointed out that the registration form alone does not “sell” the meeting. Ellen Gray said that she will send the group a letter describing the meeting that will also be useful to hand out.

V. Next Meeting

The BOD will meet on September 25th from 10-12 am at a location to be determined. The next meeting will include review of the annual administrative work plan and report, Monitoring Workshop follow-up and review of the Phase I report due to WASO, and an update on biological inventories.

Attachment 1. SAC Participants (Updated 6-4-02)

First	Last	Agency
Ed	Barrows	Georgetown University
Scott	Bates	NPS - National Capital Region
Scott	Bell	NPS - Catoctin Mountain Park
Pat	Bradley	US EPA - MAIA
Ann	Brazinski	NPS - George Washington Memorial Parkway
Cheryl	Bright	Smithsonian Institution - National Museum of Natural History
Wendy	Cass	Shenandoah National Park
Ray	Chaput	NPS - National Capital Region
Pete	Chirico	USGS
Jim	Comiskey	Smithsonian Institution - National Museum of Natural History
Doug	Curtis	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program
Danielle	Denenny	USGS
John	Galli	DC - COG
Bryan	Gorsira	NPS - MANA
Ellen	Gray	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program
Gary	Hevel	Smithsonian Institution - National Museum of Natural History
Bob	Higgins	NPS - GRD
Dianne	Ingram	NPS - Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park
Lisa	Jameson	NPS - NCR
Christophe r	Jones	NPS - WOTR
Melissa	Kangas	NPS - George Washington Memorial Parkway
Paul	Kazyak	MD DNR
Dorothy	Keough	DOD
Marcus	Koenen	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program
Tom	Kopczyk	NPS - MONO
David	Krask	DC - COG
Becky	Lancosky	NPS - CATO
James	Lawry	George Mason University
Jennifer	Lee	NPS - Prince William Forest Park
Mikaila	Milton	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program
Dale	Nisbet	NPS - Harpers Ferry
Gopaul	Noojibail	NPS - NACC
Marian	Norris	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program
Allan	O'Connell	USGS - BRD
Diane	Pavek	NPS - National Capital Region
Sue	Salmons	NPS - Rock Creek Park
Doug	Samson	The Nature Conservancy
Marie	Sauter	NPS - CHOH

Kent	Schwarzkopf	NPS - Appalachian National Scenic Trail
Chip	Scott	USDA Forest Service
Steve	Seagle	University of Maryland
Jim	Sherald	NPS - National Capital Region
John	Sinclair	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program
Craig	Snyder	USGS
Scott	Southworth	USGS
Brent	Steury	NPS - National Capital Parks/East
Jil	Swearingen	NPS - National Capital Region
Stephen	Syphax	NPS - NACE
George	Taylor	GMU - Chesapeake Watershed - CESU
Julie	Thomas	National Park Service
Pat	Toops	NPS - NCR
James	Voigt	NPS - Catoctin Mountain Park
Ed	Wenschof	NPS - Antietam/Monocacy
Christina	Wright	NPS - Inventory and Monitoring Program

Attachment 2. Monitoring Workshop Agenda.

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MONITORING WORKSHOP:
PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION**
9-11 July, 2002

National Conservation Training Center, Shepherdstown, WV

Purpose of meeting: Continue the development of an integrated and comprehensive long term Monitoring Plan for the National Capital Region of the National Park Service that provides essential information needed to preserve and enhance the region's most important natural resources.

Expected Outcomes: As a result of the meeting, we will:

- (1) create a network of stakeholders united to preserve the most important resources in the National Capital Region
- (2) review technical information developed by the Science Advisory Committee to lead to the development of a long-term monitoring plan of the region's most important resources.

Specifically, we will:

- (a) identify major threats (stressors and their sources) and their ecological effects to each important natural resource within the National Capital Region
- (b) identify ecological indicators to monitor important resources and their threats
- (c) develop monitoring objectives in line with monitoring goals guiding the National Park Service Inventory and Monitoring Program
- (d) identify protocols that could be used to monitor indicators
- (e) identify collaborative approaches to implement monitoring.

Tuesday - 9 July 02 (Day 1)

10:00	Welcome and Introductions
	Purpose and expected outcome of the Workshop
11:00	The National Park Service Inventory and Monitoring Program – how is this program relevant to the parks?
	The National Capital Region – a biological treasure chest
12:00	Lunch
1:00	The Regional Science Advisory Committee

Important Resources in the National Capital Region

Network Goals

- 2:00 Facilitated breakout sessions. Topics will include:
- Using sound science to manage the parks – exploring the relevancy of long-term monitoring to park operations.
 - Crossing park boundaries – developing partnerships to protect natural resources inside and outside of the National Parks.
 - Educating the public – how can scientists work with park interpreters?
- 4:00 Group Discussion – Building internal and external partnerships.
- 5:00 Adjourn
- 7:00 Evening Social

Wednesday - 10 July 02 (Day 2)

- 8:00 Group Discussion: Workgroup Goals and Objectives.
- 9:00 Thematic Breakout Session: Each workgroup reviews draft threats, ecological effects, and potential ecological indicators. Workgroups include: Air, Geology, Invertebrates, Landscape, Rare – Threatened and Endangered Species and Communities, Vegetation Communities, Water, Wildlife.
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Thematic Breakout Session: Workgroups identify priority monitoring goals and objectives. Identify potential protocols.
- 4:00 Group Discussion: Exploring common themes among workgroups.
- 5:00 Adjourn

Thursday - 11 July 02 (Day 3)

- 8:00 Group Discussion: Workgroup Goals and Objectives
- 9:00 Thematic Breakout Session: Workgroups develop goals and objectives.
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Group Discussion: Prioritizing workgroup objectives.

3:00 Wrap – up. Identify next tasks.

4:00 Adjourn